| Interview Summary | 10/553,199 | TOKUDA ET AL. | |
|---|--------------------------------|---------------|--|
| | Examiner | Art Unit | |
| · | JIE YANG | 1733 | |
| All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel): | | | |
| (1) <u>JIE YANG</u> . | (3) Robert T. Pous. | | |
| (2) | (4) | | To the state of th |
| Date of Interview: <u>03 November 2010</u> . | | | |
| Type: a)☐ Telephonic b)☐ Video Conference c)☒ Personal [copy given to: 1)☐ applicant | 2)⊠ applicant's representative | e] | |
| Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) Yes If Yes, brief description: | e)⊠ No. | | |
| Claim(s) discussed: <u>1,2 and 16</u> . | | | |
| Identification of prior art discussed: <u>US'471</u> . | | | |
| Agreement with respect to the claims f) was reached. g) was not reached. h) N/A. | | | |
| Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: <u>See Continuation Sheet</u> . | | | |
| (A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.) | | | |
| THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN A NON-EXTENDABLE PERIOD OF THE LONGER OF ONE MONTH OR THIRTY DAYS FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE, OR THE MAILING DATE OF THIS INTERVIEW SUMMARY FORM, WHICHEVER IS LATER, TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet. | | | |
| | | | |
| | | | |
| | | | |
| | | | |
| | | | |
| | | • | |
| | | | |
| | /Jie Yang/ | | |
| | | | |

Application No.

Applicant(s)

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: The Applicant argured that the prior art (US'471) does not teach the limitation of allowing the flow in the direction of the moving hearth in the cooling step as recited in the method claims 1 and 16. The prior art does not teach the limitation of maintaining a high pressure in melting steps as recited in the instant method claims 2 and 16. In response, the Examiner's position is US'471 teaches the similar partitions and arrangement as recited in the instant invention and the controlling the pressure and flow direction are functions of the partitions. No Agreement was reached. A possible amendents for the instant claims have been discussed.